is it indicated? What manufacturing establishments existed in Virginia at that day requiring the fostering hand of protection? Where were *then* the conventions of manufacturers to excite into active and vigorous co-operation the best ability of the ancient dominion.

Sir, the idea is preposterous. No such establishments existed — no such motive was conceived. But suppose such establishments did exist, and protection was the object, had not each State the ample power and the exclusive power to encourage and protect? Was any new power necessary? Sir, in the whole annals of legislation, I do not believe there can be found a more gross perversion of the plain import of language than that which seeks to convert "the power to regulate commerce" into a power to protect domestic manufactures; by which protection, when complete, "the power to regulate commerce" is resolved into an annihilation of commerce.

Sir, I repeat, the great object was commerce; the great evils were the want of punctuality, on the part of the States, in complying with the requisitions of Congress — the want of uniformity in commercial regulations among the different States, and the want of power lodged somewhere to make commercial treaties with foreign powers.

But, Sir, in the annual message of the President, in December, 1830, the argument in favor of the constitutionality of the protective principle is placed in a new, and, in my opinion, the strongest light, in which it can be presented. It is stated as follows:

"The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry, is so completely incidental to that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it, for the purpose of protection, does not exist in them, and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government it must be extinct."

With due respect, I think, this whole argument is vitiated by a sophism. — The fallacy consists in supposing a power in the States over a subject which might have been exercised